UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,407	09/966,407 09/28/2001 Robert E. Haines		10012345-1	8759
	7590 04/25/200 CKARD COMPANY	EXAMINER		
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			NGUYEN, TUAN HOANG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2618	
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/25/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM mkraft@hp.com ipa.mail@hp.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/966,407	HAINES ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
TUAN H. NGUYEN	2618		

	TUAN H. NGUYEN	2618					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>31 March 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidav eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>2</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires 2 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as				
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in comp	lianaa with 27 CED 41 27 must ba	filed within two month	o of the data of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core.	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause				
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belowant) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	**	duaina ar aimplifuina t	ha iaayaa far				
appeal; and/or	ter form for appear by materially re	ducing or simplifying the	ie issues ioi				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	, ,						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		. ,	,				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.							
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Nay A. Maung/	/	uon Nauven/					
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2618		uan Nguyen/ t Unit 2618					
. , ,	571-272-8329	COME 2010					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument are not persuasive. Regarding rejection of claims 1, 5, 12, and 18, applicant's argument that Burgan et al. (U.S PAT. 6,675,022 hereinafter, "Burgan") in view of Garceran et al. (U.S PAT. 6,522,888 hereinafter "Garceran") references cited by the Examiner does not teach "identify detected devices that match any selection criteria" as recited in claims 1, 5, and 18. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's argument. Burgan's reference col. 8 lines 36-48 and col. 17 line 40 through col. 18 line 8 recites this limitation i.e., figure 4, each of the plurality of synchronous transmission frames 402, 403 includes, inter alia, an outbound sync 404, 412, an address such as a broadcast address 406 or an individual address 414, a message vector 408, 416, and outbound information such as a localized information 410 and an individualized information 418. The outbound sync 404, 412 is used by the plurality of communication devices 114-119 and the second plurality of communication devices 214-217 as a means for bit synchronization utilizing techniques well known in the art. The address 406, 414 is used to identify the communication devices intended to receive the outbound information such as the localized information 410 and the individualized information 418 interpreted as "identify detected devuces that match any selection criteria". Regarding claim 12 Appliyant argues that the combination of Burgan and Garceran cannot teach, suggest or imply "querying to determine whether a wireless network device is of a desired type and has a desired status as neither reference, nor the combination, addresses associating a signal quality with a network device on the basis of determining that it has any specific device type or status". Examiner respectfuly\ly disagrees with the applicant's argument. Garceran's reference col. 8 lines 57-66 recites this limitation i.e., figure 2 during the call or if the call is active at block 115, the serving base station 56 (FIG. 2) and/or the neighboring base station(s) 60a-h can guery the wireless unit 54 at block 116 for data, such as location information and associated information or measurements. The serving cell can send signal quality measurements which can be associated with the location information and other parameters, such as the wireless unit identification, time period, date, forward or downlink traffic frequency, reverse or uplink traffic frequency or other channel frequency. Therefore, the teaching of prior art reference still read on the claimed limitations.